**REMARKS**

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed May 25, 2010. Claims 1, 3-13, 15 and 17-28 were pending in the application, and were rejected. Claims 1, 3-8, 12-13, 15, 18-19 and 22-28 have been amended. Claim 17 has been canceled. Claims 1, 3-13, 15 and 18-28 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration of the case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 101 Rejection

Claims 1-23 previously stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, specifically, for reciting a "carrier medium". In the previous response, Applicant amended the claims accordingly. Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that the Section 101 rejection has been removed.

Section 102 Rejection

The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kudukoli et al (US 20010020291, "Kudukoli"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> 1. (Currently Amended) A computer accessible memory medium storing program instructions executable by a processor to:
>
> receive from a requesting program a request to determine an invocation interface of a stored graphical program, wherein the invocation interface is usable to invoke execution of the graphical program;
>
> programmatically determine the invocation interface of the graphical program in response to the request, wherein programmatically determining the invocation interface includes programmatically determining one or more parameters that should be passed to the graphical program when invoking execution of the graphical program; and
>
> return information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program to the requesting program.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kudukoli does not teach at least the recited limitation of, "receive from a requesting program a request to determine an invocation interface of a stored graphical program, wherein the invocation interface is usable to

invoke execution of the graphical program". With respect to this limitation, the Examiner states in the Office Action:

> Kudukoli discloses the above limitation in Abstract, [0036] and [0111], where "GPG program may be operable to receive user input specifying desired functionality, indicated as user interface wizard information" clearly shows "receive a request for information regarding an interface of a graphical program".

Applicant disagrees. Kudukoli relates generally to a graphical program generation (GPG) program which is operable to automatically generate (create) a new graphical program. The cited sections of Kudukoli teach that the GPG program may receive input specifying desired functionality of the new graphical program. The GPG program will then generate (create) the new graphical program such that it has the specified functionality. Thus, Kudukoli relates generally to receiving information specifying desired functionality of a new graphical program which does not yet exist, and then generating the new graphical program based on the information. In contrast, claim 1 relates to determining an invocation interface for a stored graphical program which already exists. The cited sections of Kudukoli do not teach receiving from a requesting program a request to determine an invocation interface of a stored graphical program (e.g., a graphical program that already exists), where the invocation interface is usable to invoke execution of the graphical program.

Applicant further submits that Kudukoli also fails to teach at least the recited limitations of:

> programmatically determine the invocation interface of the graphical program in response to the request, wherein programmatically determining the invocation interface includes programmatically determining one or more parameters that should be passed to the graphical program when invoking execution of the graphical program; and

With respect to this limitation, the Examiner states in the Office Action:

> Kudukoli discloses the above limitation in ([0025], "The information may be self-describing, and/or the GPG program may include knowledge of how to in order to generate the appropriate graphical program") and ([0032], [0033], and [0104], where the received information use to generate and enable a user to execute the automatically generated program clearly shows the information

includes invoking the execution of the graphical program as claimed. The information regarding the interface is also shown in [0019].

Applicant disagrees. Kudukoli teaches that the graphical program generation (GPG) program may receive information and then create a new graphical program based on the information. At the cited paragraph [0025], Kudukoli teaches that the information on which the generation of the graphical program is based may be self-describing information. However, this does not amount to teaching the above-recited limitations of claim 1. Paragraph [0025] and the other cited sections of Kudukoli are not relevant to the cited limitations of "programmatically determine the invocation interface of the graphical program in response to the request, wherein programmatically determining the invocation interface includes programmatically determining one or more parameters that should be passed to the graphical program when invoking execution of the graphical program."

Applicant also respectfully submits that Kudukoli does not teach the additionally recited limitation of, "return information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program to the requesting program".

Applicant thus respectfully submits that the amended claim 1 is patentably distinct over Kudukoli for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite:

15. (Currently Amended) A computer accessible memory medium storing program instructions executable by a processor to:

programmatically request information specifying an invocation interface of a stored graphical program, wherein the invocation interface is usable to invoke execution of the graphical program;

receive the information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program in response to the request, wherein receiving the information includes receiving information specifying one or more parameters that should be passed to the graphical program when invoking execution of the graphical program; and

invoke execution of the graphical program using the received information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program, wherein said invoking includes passing the one or more parameters to the graphical program.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kudukoli does not teach the recited limitation of, "programmatically request information specifying an invocation interface of a stored graphical program, wherein the invocation interface is usable to invoke execution of the graphical program". With respect to this limitation, the Examiner states in the Office Action:

> programmatically request information [0018], "in response to receiving program information" inherently including request information, regarding an interface of a graphical program [0111] and the information may be any type, the information may be from another program of from other sources, such as a file or database, is shown in Abstract, where the GPG program receives the program information and the program information is programmatically determine [0116].

Applicant disagrees. As discussed above, Kudukoli teaches a graphical program generation (GPG) program operable to create a new graphical program which does not yet exist. The GPG program receives information regarding the desired graphical program to be created, and then creates the desired graphical program based on this information. This has nothing to do with requesting information specifying an invocation interface of a stored graphical program which already exists, which is what claim 1 pertains to.

Applicant further submits that Kudukoli also fails to teach:

> invoke execution of the graphical program using the received information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program, wherein said invoking includes passing the one or more parameters to the graphical program.

With respect to this limitation, the Examiner states in the Office Action:

> invoke execution of the graphical program according to the received information regarding the interface of the graphical program [0104], and (claim 45, "the GPG program further includes an invoke node; the method further comprising: the invoke node invoking a method on the graphical program object in response to said executing the GPG program").

Applicant disagrees. Paragraph [0104] merely teaches:

> Thus, executing the GPG program in step 206 may comprise invoking a routine or program associated with this application, e.g., in response to the user selecting a menu option included in the application's user interface.

This relates to invoking the graphical program generation (GPG) program, not the graphical program. Furthermore, it does not teach that the received information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program is used to invoke the execution of the graphical program.

Claim 45 teaches that the GPG program includes an invoke node which invokes a method on a graphical program object. Again however, the cited section does not teach that the received information specifying the invocation interface of the graphical program is used to invoke the execution of the graphical program.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that the amended claim 15 is patentably distinct over Kudukoli for at least the reasons set forth above.

Inasmuch as the other independent claims recite features similar to those of claims 1 and 15 discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that the other independent claims are also patentably distinct over Kudukoli.

Since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct for at least this reason. Applicant also submits that several of the dependent claims recite further distinctions not taught by Kudukoli. However, since the independent claims are believed to be allowable, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-75401/JCH.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

☒ Request for Continued Examination

☐ Terminal Disclaimer

☐ Power of Attorney By Assignee and Revocation of Previous Powers

☐ Notice of Change of Address

☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/
Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 2010-08-18 JCH/JLB